

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

The Office action rejects claims 1, 7-11, 17-19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Watanabe (USPA 2001/0005188). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

MPEP 2142 states:

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) **must teach or suggest all the claim limitations**... If the examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness."

Watanabe fails to teach or suggest a flat panel display apparatus that includes means for activating the energy recovery circuit only for a part of the total number of subfields of the discharge cells, as specifically claimed in claim 1, upon which claims 2-9 depend.

Watanabe fails to teach or suggest a method of displaying images on a flat-panel display apparatus that includes activating the energy recovery circuit only for a part of the total number of subfields of the discharge cells, as specifically claimed in claim 10.

Watanabe fails to teach or suggest a display that includes an energy recovery circuit that is configured to recover energy from select subfields that are fewer than a total number of the subfields of the discharge cell, as specifically claimed in claim 11, upon which claims 12-21 depend.

The Office action asserts that Watanabe teaches, at paragraph [0038], that charge recovery can be controlled for only a sub-field having an intensity weight that is relatively large. The applicants agree with this assertion, but respectfully note that Watanabe does not teach eliminating the charge recovery period for this subfield.

Conventional plasma displays enable charge recovery for a fixed period of time during each display period. Watanabe teaches modifying the period of the charge recovery based on the peak intensity; as illustrated in Watanabe's FIG. 4, this

control varies the period within a range of 300-500 nsec. At paragraph [0038] Watanabe teaches:

"Another alternate configuration of the present invention is one in which the charge recovery timing controller 4 performs controlling of the charge recovery period T for only a sub-field having an intensity weight that is relatively large, and does not control the charge recovery period for a sub-field having a relatively small intensity weight." (Watanabe, paragraph [0038].)

At the cited text, Watanabe merely teaches that the modification/control of the period of charge recovery is not performed for sub-fields having low intensity weight, and does not teach the elimination of the charge recovery period for these sub-fields. Watanabe's claims clearly indicate that the recovery period is merely unchanged for these sub-fields, and not eliminated:

"A drive apparatus for a plasma display panel according to claim 1, wherein said charge recovery timing control means controls to change said charge recovery period for only a sub-field that has a relatively large brightness weight, and to leave said charge recovery period for a sub-field having a relatively small brightness weight unchanged." (Watanabe, claim 6.)

Because Watanabe fails to teach or suggest activating charge recovery for a subset of the total number of sub-fields, and specifically teaches and claims a charge recovery period for each sub-field, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 1, 7-11, 17-19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Watanabe is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be withdrawn.

The Office action rejects claims 4-6 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Watanabe and Salavin et al. (USP 6,124,676, hereinafter Salavin). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 4-6 are dependent upon claim 1, and claims 14-16 are dependent upon claim 11. In this rejection, the Office action relies upon Watanabe for teaching the elements of claims 1 and 11. As noted above, Watanabe fails to teach the elements of claim 1 and claim 11. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 4-6 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies upon Watanabe for this teaching is unfounded, per MPEP 2142, and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/

Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001